

Eightieth Congress

For the first time in sixteen years the Republicans won control of Congress in the fall elections of 1946. Their platform smacked of back-to-normalcy, and no doubt reflected a popular reaction to wartime controls and sacrifices. To a considerable extent the Republican majority, frequently assisted by conservative Democrats, fulfilled its election promises. It reduced income taxes in a manner favorable to the well-to-do; it cut Presidential budgets, "in many instances recklessly," according to the *New York Times*; it watered down rent controls; it passed the Taft-Hartley Act and, in the process of outlawing portal-to-portal pay suits, weakened the Fair Labor Standards Act; it legislated in favor of rail and oil interests, in the one case passing, over a Presidential veto, the Bulwinkle bill, which practically exempts rail transportation from the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, in the other approving the Tidelands Oil bill, which was vetoed. In almost every case in which the people at large would have benefited, the Congress rejected the legislation. No civil-rights bill was passed; the minimum wage was not raised; badly needed housing legislation was permitted to die; social-security coverage was not extended; inflation went largely uncontrolled. On foreign policy, however, the back-to-normalcy note was much less insistent. Thanks to Senator Vandenberg, with timely assists from Premier Stalin of the USSR, the Congress voted military aid to Greece and Turkey, supported a huge peacetime preparedness program, including selective service, approved the Marshall plan and, after a deplorable exhibition of niggardly nationalism in the House, appropriated sufficient funds to finance it. Eventually, the Congress extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but in such fashion as to raise serious doubts about the consistency of the nation's foreign policy. Whether history will term the 80th one of the worst Congresses may be disputable. There is little doubt, however, that it will not go down as one of the greatest.

Draft legislation

When Senator Taylor of Idaho lost the floor on a point of order at 10:29 A.M. on June 19, after he and Senator Langer of North Dakota had held it alternately since 3:37 P.M. the previous day, the road was cleared for passage by voice vote of a compromise draft act. This was ratified by the House, 259 to 136, on a roll-call vote and went to the President for signature. Men 19 through 25 years of age will be subject to military service for 21 months. They may volunteer for this period of service in the Army, without waiting for the draft call. There are various exempt classes, including veterans of world War II and members of the National Guard as of the date of signing of the bill by the President. This last exemption has greatly stimulated National Guard recruiting. Mar-

ried men will generally be deferred; and the President can defer "necessary" men in industry, agriculture, science and other fields. Youths of 18 can enlist for one year, after which they will pass into the reserves and be exempt from further draft, except, of course, in case of war or national emergency. High-school students will be deferred to the end of their four-year course or until they are 20, and college students to the end of the academic year. Commenting on the draft, June 21, General Omar N. Bradley said that it calls for new viewpoints on the part of service personnel, and condemned "lack of understanding, unnecessary or harsh discipline and . . . inconsiderate assumptions of privileges." The draft has its justification as a special measure to meet a special situation, and as making it clear that the United States intends to be in a position to meet its world commitments. It may not be out of place to recall here the sabotaging of civilian control of Selective Service by the military, which Father Parsons alluded to in "Washington Front" for June 19. Congress should be on the alert to see that the same thing does not happen in the administration of the present draft law.

Displaced persons

On the principle that it is better that the United States actually admit some displaced persons rather than continue the scandal of the "closed door" policy, the House managers finally agreed to the substance of the Senate requirements. Accordingly, a bill was passed and sent to the President which was much more in line with the ideas of Senators Wiley and Revercomb than with the more liberal and humane provisions of Representative Fellows' proposal. If we express approval of action having finally been taken, we do so, like Representatives Chelf and Fellows, "reluctantly." The Fellows bill, which would have distributed admissions in proportion to the various "groups and elements" actually found in the DP camps would have been more equitable than the provision which gives 40 per cent of the visas to former inhabitants of the Baltic States and Eastern Poland. This, incidentally, does not seem to us an anti-Catholic provision; but it is arbitrary and inequitable. The Senate date for establishing DP status—December 22, 1945—takes no account of the many persons displaced by postwar events. The House date, April 21, 1947, would have been far better. We refuse to join in the clamor that the "*Volksdeutsche*"—expellees of German origin from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania or Yugoslavia, who are given 50 per cent of the regular German and Austrian quotas—are all Nazis at heart. Vast numbers of them are simple folk caught in the clash of conflicting nationalisms. Moreover, there is machinery for screening out the naziminded. All in all, while we are glad that some action has at last been taken to remove the shame of our sel-

fishness, we cannot but feel that the distinctions and refinements imposed by the Senate show a suspicious and grudging spirit, out of place in dealing with people caught in a common misery and asking to be received in the name of common humanity.

Failure on housing

The House Banking and Currency Committee has done it again. In the first session of the 80th Congress, the Committee chairman, Jesse P. Wolcott, earned for himself the reputation of an obstructionist by bottling up Federal housing legislation, much to the delight of certain elements of the real-estate lobby. The Senate had passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill several months before adjournment, and patiently awaited House action. It never came. Practically the same thing happened again this session. The House Committee, or rather its adroit chairman, sat on the T-E-W bill, despite continuous protests by its many backers. The bill finally reported by the Committee was an emasculated version of the type of national housing legislation we really need. Its chief merit was the granting of comfort to builders and realtors, in the direction of more mortgage guarantees and greater tax consideration on needed types of dwellings. In the closing hours of Congress, feelings ran high as Mr. Wolcott blocked steps to have public housing needs considered. The T-E-W bill, introduced on March 10, 1947, would have authorized funds for rather limited but definitely needed slum clearance and for some public housing, both to aid lower income groups. Ignoring the facts, the enemies of public housing have had their day. When Senator Robert F. Wagner made his report on slum clearance to the joint committee on housing, back in later winter, certain facts stood out. After analysis of returns from his detailed questionnaire, the Senator found that Mayors of 78 cities, representing 41 per cent of the urban population, estimated that 1,800,000 housing units in their cities are substandard; that 206 out of 230 replies stated that private enterprise cannot in the foreseeable future provide either new or used housing in adequate quantity for low income groups; that 196 out of 218 replies expressed a belief that public housing is necessary to meet the need. At the same time, three-fourths of the Governors and over 90 per cent of the Mayors said the cities are unable to finance construction of low-rent housing, and that they could not provide subsidies, other than tax exemption. Mr. Wolcott and his Banking and Currency Committee should catch up with the times.

AMERICA—A Catholic Review of the Week—Edited and Published by the following Jesuit Fathers of the United States:

Editor-in-Chief: JOHN LAFARGE
Managing Editor: CHARLES KEENAN
Literary Editor: HAROLD C. GARDINER
Associate Editors: BENJAMIN L. MASSE, ALLAN P. FARRELL,
WILLIAM J. GIBBONS
Contributing Editors: WILFRID PARSONS, ROBERT A. GRAHAM
J. EDWARD COFFEY, EDWARD DUFF
Editorial Office: 329 W. 108TH STREET, NEW YORK 25, N. Y.

Business Office: 70 EAST 45TH STREET, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
Business Manager and Treasurer: JOSEPH CARROLL
Promotion and Circulation: EDWARD F. CLARK

Court clarifies Taft-Hartley Act

The long, tedious job of clarifying the Taft-Hartley Act was significantly advanced last week by two decisions of the Supreme Court. In the first case, the Court sustained a lower court finding which upheld the constitutionality of both the non-communist affidavit provision of the Act and the clause requiring unions to register with the National Labor Relations Board and file financial statements. These cases had been brought by the National Maritime Union. In the other decision, the Court found that CIO President Philip Murray had not violated the Act's ban on political expenditures by ordering the *CIO News* to support the candidacy of Edward A. Garmatz of Baltimore for Congress (Cf. AMERICA, March 27, p. 704). Said Justice Stanley F. Reed, who wrote the unanimous opinion:

We are unwilling to say that Congress by its prohibition against corporations or labor organizations making an expenditure in connection with any election of candidates for Federal office intended to outlaw such a publication. We do not think Section 313 reaches such a use of corporate or labor-organization funds.

Justice Reed stressed that the Court was deciding a specific case, not passing an opinion on the scope of this controverted section or on its constitutionality. The so-called "liberals" on the Court—Justices Rutledge, Black, Douglas and Murphy—while agreeing to dismiss the indictment against the CIO leader, were sharply critical of their colleagues for not dealing forthrightly with the constitutional issue. Judge Ben Moore, of West Virginia, had found Section 313 unconstitutional, and Justice Rutledge felt that the Supreme Court should have upheld this decision. The sweeping ban on political expenditures by unions, he said, could not be squared with the First Amendment.

Christian democracy and Spain

Nothing would more quickly convince sympathetic observers of Spain's claim to full participation in the family of nations than prompt government recognition of the right of political opposition. When men are free, we know from experience, they tend to differ in attitudes towards government and to express disagreement politically. Taught by the one-party systems of Hitler, Mussolini and—above all—Stalin, Western man may be pardoned if he views the artificial unity of the present Spanish state with some skepticism. The politically mature instinctively question repeated official affirmations of solidarity, such as were made this spring on the ninth anniversary of victory in the civil war. On that occasion, the *Caudillo* informed us that "God and right are with Spain against all others," that contemporary Spain is a "beautiful ship in which all Spaniards are embarked." If such unanimity of purpose and viewpoint are deep-rooted in Spanish hearts, it should not be necessary periodically to thrust irritated Monarchist leaders and other opponents into jail, or carefully to censor political news lest the masses learn that the harmony is ill-founded. The Spanish Government should admit the need for broadening its base, for the admission of opposition

parties which reject totalitarian and authoritarian ideas. Discussion of the possibilities of a Christian Democratic party, both within Spain and by Spaniards abroad, at last heartens those who believe a free Spain has a role to play in the growing political community of Europe. The talk at present is of a party which would adhere loyally to Christian social principles, but would not be clerical in character. Nor could it approve the monolithic form of Franco's political organization. This latter, unfortunately, only lends added difficulties to the organization of a genuine CD opposition.

Pius XII and democracy

From time to time those unappreciative of the vitality inherent in democratic conduct of political affairs, bemoan democracy's weaknesses in combating the communist menace. Their own distrust of open discussion leads them to assign undue value to the arbitrary procedure we know to be employed by the Politburo in common with other strong-man regimes. There is merit, then, in recalling some remarks of the present Pope on the subject of the authoritarian state. On December 24, 1944, in the Christmas message, he said:

Taught by bitter experience [the people] are more aggressive in opposing the concentration of power in dictatorships that cannot be censured or touched, and in calling for a system of government more in keeping with the dignity and liberty of the citizens. . . . In this psychological atmosphere, is it any wonder that the tendency toward democracy is capturing the peoples and winning a large measure of approval and support from men who hope to play a more efficient part in the destinies of individuals and of society?

And addressing the Sacred Roman Rota, at its opening session in 1945, the Pontiff declared,

Equally unsatisfactory [with totalitarianism] in regard to the same vital requirement is that conception of the civil power which may be styled "authoritarian"; for this shuts out citizens from any effective share or influence in the formation of the social will. It consequently splits the nation into two categories, that of rulers and that of ruled, whose relations to each other are reduced to being of a purely mechanical kind, governed by force, or else based on purely biological considerations.

The requirement of which the Pope speaks is one he regards as essential in national life, permanent establishment of unity in the variety of members, apart from unwarranted interference by government. The actual forms of governments may vary, but this principle for judging their worth is always applicable.

ILO at San Francisco

The first big news from the San Francisco meeting of the International Labor Organization—the only agency of the League of Nations to be incorporated in the United Nations—was the election of David A. Morse, Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, to succeed Edward Phelan, of Ireland, as director general. To his new position, Mr. Morse brings a deep interest in international cooperation and wide experience in industrial relations. The new director general had a hand also in

the second piece of news from the Golden Gate, for it was he who offered the resolution to admit the World Federation of Trade Unions, the newly formed, anti-communist Inter-American Confederation of Workers and the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions to a consultative relationship with ILO. For the International Confederation of Christian Trade Unions, this marks the attainment of a long-sought goal—recognition as a *bona fide* union organization on a par with non-sectarian or socialist groups. For a long time organized labor in the U.S., with its traditional opposition to dual unionism, looked with suspicion on the Christian trade unions of Europe, little understanding the circumstances which resulted in their creation. Without doubt, the postwar experiences of CIO and AFL representatives abroad have given them a new insight into European unionism and led to a genuine appreciation of the Christian trade unions. They will make a valuable contribution to the work of ILO.

Czechoslovak resistance

Careful precautions seem to have been taken to place all the proceedings on an ostensibly normal footing, when Czechoslovakia's first communist president, Klement Gottwald, took office on June 14. He was elected by unanimous vote of the handpicked Parliament; and had taken the new ("on my honor and conscience") oath provided for in the new Constitution, which former President Benes had refused to sign. President Gottwald was reported as assisting at the *Te Deum* in St. Vitus Cathedral. But indications were not absent that storms lay ahead, the first of these being the suspension—with possibility of eventual excommunication—of Father Plojhar, Czech priest who had violated the Archbishop's regulation on priests in political office by taking a seat in the new Cabinet. There were signs, too, of passive resistance as the regime put the screws upon *Práve Lidu*, staunch social-democrat organ, and upon the famous Sokol socialist youth organization. It still remains to be seen how neatly the Iron Curtain can be clamped down on Czechoslovakia.

Man bites dog

For the inflation into which we have stumbled, despite solemn warnings and our experience after World War I, farmers blame the unions, the unions blame farmers and employers, employers blame the unions, and together all blame the Government. It is news when one economic group rises up in meeting and places some of the blame on itself. That is the justification for recording here some pungent remarks of Ephraim Freedman, director of R. H. Macy's bureau of standards. Participating in a forum held on June 9 as part of the Textile Industries Exposition in Manhattan, Mr. Freedman accused the textile industry of following an opportunistic policy with regard to both prices and quality. In a sellers' market, he complained, the industry had raised prices and cheapened quality, and now that signs of consumer resistance are becoming unmistakable, it is responding by a further cheapening of quality. The speaker warned that if the

industry persisted in this policy, it would suffer from the growing competition of paper and plastic substitutes. However strange and unpleasant it may be, there ought to be more of this kind of self-critical talk at gatherings of businessmen—and at union conventions and farm meetings, too—for such talk has the virtue of creating a proper atmosphere in economic life. It reminds those who hear it that an irresponsible pursuit of self-interest is morally wrong and frowned on socially; and that all our economic groups should strive to make progress with the community and not at its expense.

"Layfolks' Week"

Not to supplant but to supplement parish missions is the aim of the program of information and formation, based on liturgical sources, devised by an English Jesuit, Father Clifford Howell, S.J., called "Layfolks' Week." The program is based on the doctrines expounded in the two recent encyclicals *Mystici Corporis* and *Mediator Dei*. The eight evening services include instruction on the Mass to make people "sacrifice" conscious, and considerations on the Mystical Body: how we enter it through baptism; how we defend it and are healed by confirmation and confession; how it obtains its increase through marriage; its food of Holy Communion; its triumph in our death and resurrection; the chief advocate, our Lady; its head, Christ the King. A maximum of variety and of activity on the part of the people is sought: they recite together prayers from the liturgy, they take part in scripture dialogues, they sing new hymns of beauty and dignity they have been taught. The "Week" engenders a deepened appreciation of their solidarity in Christ and of their union with one another as members of God's family, the parish. Commenting on the "Layfolks' Week" in *Orate Fratres*, Father H. A. Reinhold finds the program typically English. For it takes the liturgical movement from books, desks, monasteries and magazines to the people who are, after all, to be found only in parishes.

Argentina by-passed by ECA

The Economic Cooperation Administration by-passed Argentina in its estimates for the final two quarters of 1948, according to H. Struve Hensel, consultant in Buenos Aires for the ECA. This move was hardly calculated to improve relations between the two countries. Señor Orlando Maroglio, president of the Argentine Central Bank, had previously stated that the United States was bound to lose its markets in that country unless Argentina was included in Marshall Plan purchases. It has been known for a long time that Argentina desperately needs hard currency, such as the United States dollar. The U.S. decision, however, is not final and, according to the U.S. officials, there still are prospects that Argentine products will be exchanged for dollars. This may happen even before the end of the year, provided the Argentine Government is ready to sit down and talk business. The Perón regime, it is recalled, previously set prices for its products considerably higher than other countries on the market. Consequently, the ECA admin-

istrators, when making their purchases, have been reluctant to deal with Buenos Aires. On the other hand, there is no provision that bars European nations participating in the ERP from trading with Argentina. Argentina has, in fact, a series of economic and commercial agreements with Yugoslavia, Rumania and Czechoslovakia—countries which, upon order from Moscow, are actively combating the Marshall Plan. If the present policy of the ECA-administration is somewhat against Argentina's economic interests, the fault seems to lie primarily with the government of Señor Perón. His policy of vacillating between Pan-American solidarity, as was favored during the Bogotá Conference, and his own dictatorial ambitions, cannot but be a cause of constant friction and bad feeling among the countries of the Western Hemisphere. A little more altruism in Argentine economic policy would actually be to the advantage of that country.

Homes instead of hospitals

Near Antwerp is Gheel, "The City of the Simple," where 3,000 mentally afflicted men and women live with private families, finding their therapy in home life and work fitted to their strength. For more than a thousand years the good people of Gheel have cared for the insane who have pilgrimaged to the shrine of St. Dimphna, to whose intercession many cures were attributed. The hospital attached to her shrine soon became too small, and the pilgrims later took lodging in the town and on the farms. Nearly a hundred years ago the Gheel system became a national institution in Belgium, with the Government paying for the maintenance of the impecunious, non-violent patients in private homes. Today, as George Kent reports in the June *Survey Graphic*, ten of our States and three Canadian Provinces employ the family-care method, inaugurated at Gheel, as a definite technique in the treatment of 7,000 of our mentally ill, principally the elderly. As a result, many patients become more cooperative, more interested, with recoveries in different areas approaching fifty per cent. The family-care program, supervised by physicians and competent social workers, can do much for ten to fifteen per cent of the patients in our overcrowded mental institutions. Obstacles to the extension of the program abound: the difficulty of finding sympathetic and mature families to take such boarders, the suspicion and fear of the public, paucity of supervisory personnel. A religious inspiration seems imperative.

The Church and gambling devices

The Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York has recently put the ban on gambling devices at church bazaars. This will revive a perennial controversy. Without claiming to judge the question, may we suggest to readers a line of thought. Do not circumstances largely determine whether "wickedness is being occasioned"? In some big parishes bingo may look suspiciously like a racket; in some little ones, simple chance devices may merely add a mild diversion to the sober job of helping to support the church. The bishop of each locality is usually the best judge.

Washington Front

This is written at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia before the balloting for the Presidential nomination, and it may be a good time to observe that in reality there are two Republican parties. The cleavage may be less sharp than in the Democratic Party, but it is there, and is just as apparent in this convention as it was in the recent GOP-controlled Congress. It is important to understand this, because today the odds favor the Republicans to take over Washington next January.

The one Republican party is the party of the reactionary House leadership and of men such as Taber of the House Appropriations Committee and Knutson of Ways and Means. It is the leadership which tried so hard to butcher one progressive measure after another in the last weeks of the session. It was the leadership which made a cynical joke of the 1944 Republican platform and has deeply embarrassed the more enlightened Republicans here at Philadelphia.

The other Republican party is the party of able congressional leaders such as Vandenberg, Lodge, Baldwin, Ives, and others, whose greatest efforts were needed to restrain their fellows in the House from a swing-back to the 1870's. Governor Dewey more often than not has been lined up with this side, and Warren of California

nearly always. On a number of important issues Senator Taft has been with this group.

The indications are that the convention will choose a nominee closer to the progressive side than to the reactionary—a Dewey, a Vandenberg or a Warren. But that will not mean the reactionaries are licked. It will take force and courage from the White House, assuming a November victory for the Republicans, to stand off the determined obstructionism of the Knutsons and Tabers. A factor which weighed in Mr. Vandenberg's reluctance to bid actively for the Presidency was the fear that the isolationists might ride into new power in the Senate and rip apart much of the bipartisan foreign policy.

Here in Philadelphia the any-Republican-can-win-in-November idea does not have nearly the vogue it would have had if President Truman's recent cross-country trip had been a flop. Mr. Truman demonstrated that he can attract crowds, that he is capable of waging an aggressive campaign, that he has a friendly, homespun manner which helps him with an audience. In some respects his trip was poorly managed politically, and it's true that as long as the President speaks off-the-cuff he will blunder into saying the wrong thing now and then.

But it is the opinion of this reporter, who was along on Mr. Truman's trip, that it represented net gain for him. He still seems unlikely to win in November. But he has shown himself formidable enough to suggest to the Republicans that their campaign this fall should be geared to 1948 and not to the Mark Hanna-William McKinley era.

CHARLES LUCEY

Underscorings

Add another Catholic "alumnae college" to those listed here June 19: the eleventh annual back-to-the-classroom venture of the alumnae association of the College of New Rochelle, N. Y., June 4 to 6. This year's college began with an international dinner, featuring Rev. John LaFarge, S.J., editor of *AMERICA*, and Dr. Anna Brady of CIP in a discussion of "A Better World." Other sessions were on "Deepening Our Faith" and "Practical Approaches to Modern Problems"—marriage and parenthood, the social order, education and religion, the economic order and labor.

► *Catholic conventions in July*: 5-9, the 4th annual Street Preaching Institute, Carthage, Mo.; 12-17, Summer School of Catholic Action, University of Detroit; 13-16, biennial convention of the Catholic Daughters of America, Los Angeles; 16-19, the 10th annual conference of the Christian Brothers Education Association, St. Mary's College, Calif.; 26-31, Summer School of Catholic Action, Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio.

► In connection with the National Building Convention and Exposition, which St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind., is sponsoring from June 30 through July 3 at the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, a nation-wide Catholic building

survey was conducted, with these findings: in the next ten years the Catholic Church will spend \$10 billion for constructing, remodeling and furnishing hospitals, schools, churches, recreation centers, etc. Information about 1,534 building programs is included in the survey. Here are some of the projects: 38 hospitals to cost \$44,393,000; 83 high schools to cost \$39,130,000; 316 churches to cost \$39,108,000; 236 grade schools to cost \$32,306,500; 57 college buildings at a cost of \$30,545,000; 124 recreation centers at a cost of \$16,812,000; 160 convents at a cost of \$13,812,000.

► The unique yearbook which the students of Marygrove College, Detroit, have been publishing since 1940, has for title this year, "Generation to Generation: Youth in Every Age." Its series of well-written student essays deal with youth in the ancient world, in the age of Cicero, in the medieval milieu; martyred youth, youthful founders and reformers, university students, underprivileged youth, roots of the problem of modern youth, youth movements of modern times. A concluding study summarizes the messages of contemporary Popes to youth. There are nine pages of bibliography.

► The Confraternity of Pilgrims (109 N. Dearborn St., Chicago 2) is celebrating its silver jubilee this year by conducting a special high-school pilgrimage to the cities and shrines of Canada, July 9 to 24. Founder and president of the non-profit Confraternity is Patrick W. O'Grady.

A. P. F.

Editorials

GOP at Philadelphia

Almost a century ago—ninety-two years to be exact—the Republican party met for the first time and nominated John Frémont for the presidency. The great issue in those days was slavery and the Union, and that issue was finally resolved by war. The man who led the North to victory and saved the Union was the first Republican President, the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

Last week the Republicans convened again in Philadelphia, but this time they were performing on a vastly expanded stage. What the GOP did there, the platform it adopted and the candidate it chose, were matters which concerned much more than the North and South. They attracted the attention of the whole world.

The reason for this was simple. After 170 years of unparalleled development, following two victorious world wars, the original Thirteen Colonies had become the mightiest nation in the world. This rise to eminence coincided with such a challenge to free men as the world had not seen since the power of Christ conquered the pagan empire of ancient Rome. Through no choice of theirs, through what men call, with insufficient attention to the over-ruling providence of God, the accidents of history, the American people have been projected into a position of leadership in the fateful struggle between what is left of the free world and the Godless totalitarianism of Soviet Russia. On the foreign policy adopted by this country hangs the issue of peace or war in our times. On it hangs also the future of the free nations of Western Europe and a chance for the Orient to develop along democratic lines. The issue at Philadelphia is again slavery, only with a difference which this time is as wide as the difference between the U. S. of 1856 and the whole wide world of today. And this time the Republicans are not nominating a candidate in a hopeless cause, as was the case with Frémont in 1856: according to most observers, the nominee they select will very likely be the next President of the United States.

That is why the eyes of the world last week were on Philadelphia.

With no suggestion of partisanship, it would be fair to say that our friends abroad watched the proceedings with grave anxiety, and that this anxiety was shared by the millions of people in this country who appreciate the nature of the totalitarian threat to world peace, to freedom, to security, and who understand the delicate and dangerous role the U. S. must play to turn it aside. This anxiety arises from the strength of the isolationist and narrowly nationalist elements in the GOP and the possibility that these may capture the Party and dominate the next Administration. During the closing days of the 80th Congress, the attitude of the Republican majority in the

House of Representatives was ominously disturbing. It is no exaggeration to say that it encouraged our enemies and depressed our friends the world over. It raised serious doubts about the ability of the Republican Party to govern during a period of unprecedented crisis.

Such being the case, there was special interest in what the resolutions committee would say on foreign policy. The tentative draft left little to be desired. In the following words, it incorporated the Marshall Plan as supported by Senator Vandenberg:

America is deeply interested in the stability, security and liberty of other independent peoples. Within the prudent limits of our economic welfare, we shall cooperate, on a basis of self-help and mutual aid, to assist other peace-loving nations to restore their economic independence and to preserve and perpetuate the human rights and fundamental freedoms for which we fought two wars and upon which dependable peace must build.

There followed a fighting sentence which repudiated the nationalist wing of the Party. "We will implement," read the text, "with appropriations any commitment made by legislative enactment." But this was too much for the Martin-Taber-Halleck-Chicago *Tribune* group and in the final draft they were strong enough to have it deleted. The foreign-policy plank, however, as it emerged from the Resolutions Committee, is definitely internationalist. Unless the Convention nominates a nationalist, the public can feel reasonably assured that a Republican administration will continue our present foreign policy.

Domestic platform

On domestic issues the split personality of the GOP is much less evident than on foreign affairs. Unlike the Democrats, who are hopelessly divided between liberals and reactionaries, the Republican Party as a whole is somewhere to the right of center. Except for a tiny minority of liberal mavericks, and on all questions save those touching the Negro, the normal Party outlook is conservative. This outlook is clearly reflected in the domestic planks of the platform.

In view of the intra-party fight in the 80th Congress over housing, the resolution on that subject had to be delicately handled. It was. The tentative plank drafted by a subcommittee declared: "We recommend Federal aid to the States for local slum clearance and low-rental housing programs, wherever there is need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities." This statement reflected Senator Taft's position, which some House GOP leaders have called "socialistic." In the final rewording, the ultra-conservatives won a slight compromise. The "wherever" in the original was changed to "only where." Similarly, on discrimination in

employment, the ultra-conservatives showed their power. A clear endorsement of a Fair Employment Practice Commission was watered down to noble generalities.

By and large, the platform approves the conservative measures passed by the 80th Congress, blames inflation on the White House, promises further tax reductions "to provide incentives for the creation of new industries and new jobs, and to bring relief from inflation," and advocates a number of popular measures which the 80th Congress failed to pass. Like all political platforms, it is designed to appeal to as many groups as possible, to step on the fewest possible toes. Only organized labor comes off badly, probably because GOP chieftains figure they cannot win the support of labor leaders anyhow.

The concluding paragraph of the platform is worth quoting in full:

Guided by these principles, with continuing faith in Almighty God, united in the spirit of brotherhood, and using to the full the skills, resources and blessings of liberty with which we are endowed, we, the American people, will courageously advance to meet the challenge of the future.

With those splendid sentiments, which are in the best traditions of our nation, everybody will agree.

The battle for Germany

The crucial and drawn-out contest for control of Germany has entered what seems to be a decisive phase. The general trend is indicated by several recent developments. The Western Allies have taken a second important step toward realization of a German state by introducing the new German currency in their respective zones. The deflated monetary unit, *deutsche Mark*, replacing the old *Reichsmark* used since the inflation days of 1923, is itself symbolic of an improved order for postwar Germany.

The driving motive behind the new monetary policy is the declared intent of the Western Allies to lift Germany out of the quagmire of economic ruin; and, through the ERP, they have hopes of making the country a workable and productive member of the Western European community. The new currency is calculated to boost the German economy by reducing domestic debt, by normalizing wages and prices and by creating an atmosphere of greater stability.

Soviet Russia's reaction to the new currency system in Western Germany was typical. Marshal Sokolovsky, Soviet commander in Eastern Germany, immediately issued a "proclamation," denouncing the Western Allies and accusing them of completing the division of Germany. The Marshal prohibited all money deals with the Western zones and announced that the Russians, too, would introduce a new currency system in their zone of Germany.

The Western Allies' new currency move has evidently created a tense situation in the Soviet sector of Berlin, and the Russians show signs of hastily initiating their own financial reform. Since the German capital is not part of the Soviet economy, any attempt by the Russians to introduce their currency in Berlin is bound to evoke a strong reaction on the part of the Western Powers. On

other fronts, the sovietization of Eastern Germany is in full swing. Even at this writing, eight Soviet satellite Foreign Ministers are meeting with Mr. Molotov in Warsaw to plan an Eastern German state as a countermeasure to the Six-Power plan for a Western German state.

The Western Allies, on the other hand, are proceeding with plans for a Western German state. The difficulty created by the French regarding the Ruhr does not loom as large as it did previously. Even though France has not succeeded in detaching the Ruhr from Germany, specific French interests and security would appear to be amply safeguarded. And creation of an international authority for the Ruhr marks a definite step toward supervising German disarmament as well as toward the control of German industrial output.

According to U.S. Military Government officials, the following steps will be taken: 1) a meeting of a preparatory commission of fifteen to twenty German authorities on constitutional law to draft a constitution for the new state; 2) submission of the constitution for approval by an assembly on September 1, 1948; 3) approval of the constitution by the three Western Allies; and 4) the actual organization of the new Western German government.

There no longer exists any doubt of the practicality of the present course of the Western Allies in Germany. In the past, while we waited and debated, the Russians went ahead with plans for a communized Germany, which they hoped to use as a springboard for further conquests and aggressions. It is now our move.

UN Declaration on Human Rights

Publication on June 19 of this year of the proposed United Nations Declaration on Human Rights was not a noisy affair. It slipped quietly into the daily press, overshadowed by pre-convention news, Palestine, the draft filibuster, the President's tour, the UMW dispute, Berlin currency reform, and a dozen other contentious matters, all strident with the excitement of human differences. Agreements, for the most part, do not make big headlines, especially when they are reached under such obstacles as beset the arduous sessions of the UN Commission on Human Rights. The declaration is now ready for submission to the Economic and Social Council in July, for final approval. However, it has already sufficient finality to be extremely significant. The full applications of such a document, obviously, are not apparent at the moment of its first appearance; but become clear in the course of time, as its provisions are invoked by victims of injustice or planners of policies, by governments, parties, individuals, in good or bad faith.

History created the Human Rights Declaration, for it grew out of a general and agonized response to such frightful assaults upon the conscience of mankind as the world has never seen; out of the even more alarming consciousness that these same assaults are still continuing and threaten all of us in the near future; out of the

determined action of enlightened American citizens at San Francisco, who urged the creation of a Commission on Human Rights as a "necessary part of permanent peace"; and, finally, out of the painstaking and persevering participation of a multitude of voluntary agencies, representing the moral and religious convictions of citizens at home and abroad.

It was a work that had to be undertaken, even if something far short of perfection was to be attained. Men of today, in the words of John W. Davis, chairman of the committee urging this procedure, "must set their feet on this path if civilization is to be justified by its work."

Perhaps the simplest observation to make about a document that would require a volume for adequate comment, is to say that considering the circumstances under which it was produced, it is remarkably good.

What we have to "consider" is the abnormal situation symbolized, let us say, by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt when, as spokesman for the U. S. delegation to the Commission, she was endeavoring week after week and month after month to explain to the Soviet and satellite representatives just how people in the Western countries felt about such matters as the equal dignity and rights of human beings (Art. 1); involuntary servitude (Art. 4); arbitrary arrest (Art. 7); the right to leave any country, including one's own (Art. 11); the right to own property alone (Art. 15); to freedom of opinion and expression and "freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers" (Art. 17); the right to freedom of assembly and association (Art. 18); etc.

The influence of the religious groups is particularly evident in the assertion that "everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, which includes the right to change his belief or to manifest it in public or in private." While this wording is not strictly acceptable from the Catholic viewpoint, the substance is guaranteed of what Catholics and all believers rightly claim against totalitarian invasion of the individual's rights. And the strong stand of the Catholic Church on the family is reflected in Art. 14, which states that "the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection."

The detailed "social" articles (20-23; 26) are a new departure in the field of human-rights declarations. Though they, in turn, reflect the strong pressure exerted by the Soviets for the embodiments of such pronouncements, their wording is entirely in accordance with well recognized Christian principles. They include the "right to work and pay, and to protection against unemployment" (Art. 21); the right to an adequate standard of living, and to security in the event of various disasters or old age (Art. 22:1); and state that "mother and child have the right to special care and assistance" (Art. 22:2). Generally popular is apt to be Art. 24: "Everyone has the right to rest and leisure."

The reception and study given to the Declaration will greatly affect the development of its sister document, the proposed Covenant on Human Rights, which is still to appear.

Children as communist pawns

Rumors that Greek guerrilla bands, which constitute the army of the "Provisional Democratic Government of Greece," a puppet under Moscow control, have been kidnapping Greek children into neighboring communist states, were authenticated on June 20 by Queen Frederika. In an interview with a *New York Times* correspondent, the Queen stated that between eight and ten thousand children have been spirited away into Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary and Albania for the purpose of indoctrinating them as a future communist and Slavophile nucleus in Greek life. To save other Greek children in the civil-war areas from a like fate, the Queen directs a wide program for the removal of the children to safe areas.

Reports of this horrible communist tactic were strengthened by evidence of communist publication of photos, which actually show starving Greek children under German occupation, but which communists have used to depict the plight of the young under Athens' "monarchofascist" regime.

Gen. Markos Vafiades, leader of the Greek Rebel Army, promptly denied the charge in a letter to Trygve Lie, UN Secretary General, claiming that the children had been transferred at the request of their mothers, "who wished to save their children from starvation, death by bombing, deportation to far-away asylums or probable forced employment as servants to rich Greek families."

If further evidence of the truth of the situation is required, it is to be found in the strong protest issued by the Catholic bishops of Greece, which thoroughly backs the charges of kidnaping. In part, the episcopal protest declares:

Greece is the victim of the basest of crimes ever committed against a free and civilized people—the compulsory mass abduction of children, who are carried off from their families by men without conscience and sent far from their country for the purpose of being educated in atheism and class hatred. Revolting as it is, there is nothing surprising in this communist program. It is but a logical application of the soulless doctrine that man is the creature of the state, that he exists for the state and for nothing beyond the state—a doctrine with which even children have been made all too familiar in some countries.

This Greek tragedy is a melancholy commentary on the fate that faces children in all Eastern Europe. It calls for serious reflection on the recent Senate cut in appropriations for the International Emergency Children's Fund—of the \$60 million desired, only \$20 million were made available, and the reason was that so much of the aid would very likely go to children behind the Iron Curtain. It may be debatable whether it is better to save children from starvation or to let them die before they can grow into Communists, but one thing is certain: it is the Communists who are dooming the children. The free nations, with the United States in the lead, have stood ready to help. That help to children has been made impossible is another crime that history will chalk up indelibly against the Red terror.

Postwar Japan builds for peace

Kotaro Tanaka

Dr. Kotaro Tanaka, Professor of Law in the Imperial University of Tokyo, became a Protestant in his student days, but was converted to Catholicism in 1926 after a tour of Europe. Formerly the subject of attacks by Japanese militarists, he is now opposed by the Communists.

There must be those among the occupation forces who, seeing the mute and inexpressive attitude of the Japanese, are wondering with a vague apprehension whether these people are really glad that peace is restored, or whether there may not rather be thoughts of revenge and hatred lurking behind that bearing of theirs. This silent and expressionless attitude in our people is partly due to our national character, fostered by the custom prevailing among us of considering it a virtue not to express our emotions openly. But it is also due to the fact that the tragic experiences of war, such as losing our dear ones and having our houses burned, are still too vivid in our minds, and cast dark shadows over the feelings of joy which we would otherwise entertain at the coming of peace.

Moreover, it could hardly be expected that the fear of gendarmerie government and military-police government should be quickly dispersed. It was also inevitable under the circumstances that the Japanese masses, who had been dragged along and spurred on by the slogan of a Holy War and the fallacious propaganda of victory, should have little inclination to express their emotions freely at the arrival of peace, but should have let the one slogan of "The Preservation of National Polity" take care of all other feelings.

Incidentally we must note here that, although the cry for "The Preservation of National Polity" was of course a genuine expression of the respect and love the Japanese people feel toward the Emperor, it should also be understood that one of the reasons why so much emphasis was put on this obvious slogan lay in the domestic problem of preventing rebellion from arising within the country. Though the wording of this slogan smacks of the mythological and the mystical, it does not imply any totalitarian or irrational elements such as were found in the former slogan of "The Clarification of National Polity," which was used in bringing pressure upon the liberal thinkers. Just as the Imperial Restoration and the policy of opening Japan to foreign intercourse were united in the Meiji Restoration, so were pacifism and the claim of liberating our political world from the tyranny of the military clique combined in this slogan of "The Preservation of National Polity." In fact, the liberals, who were denied freedom of speech during the war, had already been making use of this slogan as a camouflage for their desires for peace.

Indeed, the majority of the people did not want to have the war started. We had misgivings about the China Affair as to its object—which was changed often enough—and as to the nature of the Affair itself. It was the same with the "Great East Asia War." Therefore, for all the vehement clamor of the leaders, the people's morale could by no means bear comparison with the strong national unity presented on the occasion of the Russo-Japanese War. The

greater part of the people knew intuitively that the war situation was to our disadvantage, and were longing for peace; and even the rest of the people were in such a state of mind that they would surely have wished the same, had they but been informed of the truth.

It must not be hard to infer from those circumstances how the majority of the people inwardly received the peace that was brought to us through our defeat.

This explains the fact that our people harbor but a surprisingly small amount of hostility toward the Allied forces, and especially toward the United States Army. They were the people who, standing on the very brink of losing life or home, had presence of mind enough to look up and gaze admiringly—with exclamations of esthetic admiration—at the silver wings of B29's flying in the blue sky. To them, those weapons of civilization appeared merely as a neutral and irresistible force of nature. As to the peace-minded or liberal thinkers, they saw clearly that the air raids upon our cities were not simply to be accepted as the doings of an irresistible force; that our foe was not America, but the military clique within our own country, for that was the one group responsible for the tragic misfortunes inflicted upon us. This insight the masses are now gradually obtaining, as the cause of war and the course it took are being made known to the general public.

We are sorry, however, that since the fifteenth of August, 1945, the frequent official statements issued by the Government and the tenor of the press comments do not truly reflect the actual feelings of the masses, or at least those of the intelligentsia, who are lovers of freedom and peace. Despite all the efforts made in that direction, the present political set-up and the organs of public opinion are still quite inadequate in functioning as channels for expressing the voice of the people. Therefore, public opinion in the Allied countries is said to be stiffening, a thing which is, after all, but natural.

"Since the Imperial Rescript has been promulgated to that effect, we must bear the unbearable and sincerely fulfill the conditions laid down in the Potsdam Declaration," say our Government and our papers. This is, however, an attitude that places all responsibility in the Emperor. In following the Rescript, we should follow it wholeheartedly, with a perfect understanding of the rational basis underlying the Rescript—that is, the reason and the circumstances that led to its promulgation.

Let us consider the expression, "to bear the unbearable." We are fully aware that the conditions laid down in the Potsdam Declaration are by no means easy. Those severe conditions are to be borne as expiation for the great crimes our people have committed against China, the various countries in the South and other Allied nations, and also against mankind in general. Neverthe-

less, we should realize that, however heavy that load may be, it is still nothing compared to the miseries that would have been our lot had we chosen to stick to the course of absolute resistance as the militarists desired; and we should be thankful that peace has been brought about.

Though our people suffered many years under the yoke of the military clique, the harm done to them was not so deep-rooted as in the case of Germany under Hitler or of Italy under Mussolini. On the occasion of the Tripartite Alliance—that fatal mistake—the problem of whether it should be concluded or not was discussed in tens of important meetings, and led to several Cabinet changes. Even in the midst of the “Great East Asia War” we saw three different Cabinets succeed one after the other. Although leadership always lay in the Army, and although in the course of political changes many political conspiracies and other underhand machinations were involved, the above facts still prove that public opinion was reflected in politics to a greater extent than it was in the other totalitarian countries, and that at least there was some resistance against military dictatorship among the people of Japan.

The recent prevalence in our politics, education, thought and culture of militarism and totalitarianism, directly imported from the Axis countries, was partly a reaction against the predominance of Marxism in the past. Further, it was undeniably due in part to a shallow opportunism that simply echoed totalitarian tendencies in other parts of the world. Finally, it was also derived from our national character, which is deficient in reflective and philosophical elements and has the tendency to fawn upon authorities and to follow blindly anything that is new and unusual. This defect in our national character is particularly conspicuous in our intelligentsia, whose thoughts tend to go from one extreme to another and can hardly keep the “golden mean.” That is why our militaristic education is surprisingly superficial, despite the fact that it appeared to have an efficient set-up supported by a strong military machine.

What we rather fear for our people is to see them adopt, out of a wrong spirituality, irrationalism and totalitarianism, a similarly wrong materialism and selfishness, and the mistaken notion that the natural sciences are omnipotent. The greatest danger lies in the lack of culture in our people, moral corruption, lack of political training and the tendency to despise religious piety. We wish that the universal moral code, the natural law, which is invariable throughout the ages and throughout the East and the West, may come to govern our politics, education, economy and culture. For if we adhere to the law of nature, it will be possible for us to do away with militarism and nationalism and attain a true harmony between the East and the West, internationalism and nationalism.

Facing the fact of surrender, our thinkers say: “Since Japan has been disarmed and has been placed under restriction as to its economic development, there is no way left for us but to foster morals and culture.” We are, however, convinced that the fostering of morals and culture should have been our national policy from the first.

We should have known this and been convinced of it before our defeat and before the outbreak of war. We should always have kept ourselves above war and peace, victory and defeat. If it is only through defeat that we have been able to gain this conviction, then all the tremendous sacrifices of the war and the hardships we shall have to face hereafter must be called an inevitable price which we shall have had to pay for that most precious of lessons.

Our morality and culture have been distorted and have been going astray, especially for the past ten years under the pressure of the military clique. Instead of having politics serve morality and culture, morality and culture



were reduced to slavery under political power. Now the first step is being made toward building up a moral and cultural nation. For that purpose we must first of all restore the authority and autonomy of morality and culture, which have been lost for a long time. The impure and unhealthy elements in society must be cleared away;

and the true, the good and the beautiful must be sought after.

Our people have the tendency to think in a political and utilitarian way like followers of Machiavelli. We would like to emphasize, however, that it is only when we do not restrict our aim to an immediate political result that we can really display true political effectiveness. Similarly, it is only when we try to contribute directly to the progress and the welfare of human society in general—aside from any immediate advantage to be secured for one's own country—that we can show the greatness of our country, gain the confidence of other nations and eventually bring about a return of our own prosperity. We must follow the natural law, respect human rights and proceed freely and conscientiously to build up a new, cultural Japan. To this end we must reflect upon the fundamental problems of education and achieve a thorough reform, not from a feeling of external coercion but from an inner urge. Let us do away with all such utilitarian calculations as trying to obtain advantages for our country by fulfilling the Potsdam Declaration. Let us do it sincerely and courageously, from an inner moral need as an expiatory act for the great crimes and mistakes we committed in the past.

Ideals are never set too high. Long have we forgotten the truth of the words: “What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?” Let us make our goal a peaceful world where swords are hammered into plowshares. “All they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.” By the sword we were brought to the brink of annihilation. But now we are deprived of that sword. The risk, therefore, is removed of our perishing by the sword in the future. We should greatly rejoice in the fact that thus we have been given the possibility of becoming a pioneer for world peace.

Action in the marketplace

Robert B. Morrissey

Robert B. Morrissey, graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and for five years a teacher on its Physics staff, has been a visiting Professor at Barnard College and Columbia University. For the past fifteen years he has been Professor of Physics at Manhattanville.

To what extent Catholic colleges are realizing the fullness of their educational opportunities, and whether there are serious discrepancies between their aims and accomplishments, are questions that demand our profound concern. Thus the annual crop of controversial articles on Catholic education in AMERICA may indicate sincere efforts in constructive criticism, without which human administration might well develop into a smug and atrophying deterioration. The vigor and growth of our institutions require continual re-examination, recognition of shortcomings, correction of our weaknesses, improvements in technique and enlargement of scope.

Although American college enrollments generally have increased greatly in these postwar years, we may still be justly gratified by the large increases reported for Catholic colleges (AMERICA, Jan. 31) and by the number of new Catholic colleges which have opened. Yet what percentage of Catholics is attending non-Catholic colleges? The actual statistics might be startling. For example, how does the number of Catholics attending Boston University (Methodist) compare with the number attending Boston College (Catholic)? Or how many Catholics are attending New York University as compared with Catholics at Fordham? And so forth.

A country-wide analysis of Catholics attending non-Catholic colleges should disturb all Catholics—but it won't. There will doubtless be some who, with a shrug of the shoulders, will in effect remark: "So what? Does that mean they are going to lose their faith? Don't they have Newman Clubs at non-Catholic colleges?"

While such questions are not very profound, they are by no means irrelevant. If the recent survey of Harvard University students by Professor Gordon Allport may be taken as roughly typical, the apostasy among Catholic students in non-Catholic colleges is not over fifteen per cent. Although the second question is largely rhetorical, it should be remarked that a great many non-Catholic colleges do have active Newman Clubs or their equivalent (Harvard and M.I.T. had Catholic Clubs before the Newman Club movement began). But even the well-organized Newman Clubs do not embrace in their active ranks all the eligible Catholic students. While his experience may not be typical of all Newman Clubs, the writer can draw on his participation both as a student member and a faculty advisor of a Catholic Club which fortunately had an excellent chaplain. Yet our best efforts could muster hardly more than half of the Catholic students for our meetings and Communion breakfasts. And a Newman Club, however well run, is not and cannot be an adequate substitute for the Catholic education that a Catholic should get at the college level.

There is nothing new in the call for *action in the marketplace*. Considerable *action* goes on there: through

the St. Vincent de Paul, the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, Catholic Interracial Councils, the Jockists, the Catholic Evidence Guild, the Catholic War Veterans and the Catholic Institute of the Press—to mention only several representative examples from a list that could be greatly extended. Yet so important is the general need for *action* that it has been explicitly or implicitly expressed again and again in AMERICA and in the recent joint statement of our Catholic bishops.

While recognizing the need for *action*, we recall also the sound philosophical principle that *being* comes before *action*. Catholics must know "our great *corpus* of doctrine on social rights, political justice and freedom" if they are to take effective action. Otherwise "supposedly educated Catholics," as Father LaFarge remarks (AMERICA, Feb. 7) "are apparently at sea in such matters."

A recent survey by Prof. Clement S. Mihanovich of St. Louis University (AMERICA, Feb. 7) shows that 56.88 per cent of our prominent Catholic laymen and laywomen received their bachelor's degree from non-Catholic colleges. Think of the potential in that group that might have been trained through Catholic higher education for effective *action in the marketplace*!

Certain conclusions are obvious. We need 1) more laymen and laywomen whose Catholic training measures up to their secular learning and position in life; 2) a great many more Catholic students in Catholic colleges; 3) more and larger Catholic colleges; 4) a long-range program of more scholarship aid—through loan funds—to needy and deserving students (a private survey made some years ago revealed that a great many Catholics were attending non-Catholic colleges because of greater opportunities to work their way and to obtain financial aid); 5) enlargement of the scope and wider use of our Catholic colleges.

This last requirement would seem to call for: 1) more labor schools, possibly even a labor college attached to one of our Catholic universities; 2) more extension courses, some designed to provide, in part at least, for the deficiencies which Catholic graduates of non-Catholic colleges would normally have in Catholic doctrine, and others to stimulate and keep alive the Catholic intellectual life of the alumni and alumnae.

That all this can be glibly stated but not so easily accomplished is evident. Programs of this sort require active cooperation and material support by the laity, and someone will doubtless mention that Catholic colleges in general have not received the large endowments that many non-Catholic colleges happily enjoy. Perhaps one reason for this has been suggested by Father Gabriel Zema (AMERICA, Sept. 27, 1947, p. 728):

If we can have reason to fear the beginning of a subtle and gradually spreading disintegration of Catholic

life, may not the cause of it be placed, partly at least, at the door of educational administrators who have not *integrated* in some regulated way the schools with the alumni and the alumni with the schools? . . . Witness, for example, the tremendously effective work sponsored for graduates by secularizing agencies in the educational field through alumni associations and alumni councils. The continued interest, the friendly spirit, the helping hand, the vision

and zeal shown by those who are not Catholics have much to teach us.

In considering only these aspects of *action in the marketplace*, there is no intention of delimiting the scope and importance of the problem. Nor is it contended that the solution offered here is sufficient; merely that it is an important requisite. But more important than *being* in the mind is *being* in the souls of those who would act.

They chose to die

Vera Gibian

Vera Gibian, a native of Czechoslovakia who has lived in the United States for the past several years, is a frequent contributor to American journals on events and personalities relating to the history, politics and art of Central Europe.

On the morning of February 18, 1943, the University of Munich was the scene of a dramatic event. Two of the students—the 24-year-old medical student, Hans Scholl, and his 21-year-old sister, Sophie Scholl, student of philosophy—climbed the circular stairs of the entrance hall, and from its top threw into the stairwell hundreds of anti-nazi leaflets, the text of which was a passionate protest against nazism—in the name of German youth. “There is for us,” the pamphlets began, “only one major purpose—to fight nazism”:

We ask for true learning and true freedom of thought. No threats can intimidate us, even the threat of closing our university. . . .

Freedom and honor! For ten years Adolf Hitler and his collaborators have distorted the meaning of those two words. . . . By this time even the most naive German knows about the horrors the Germans have perpetrated in Europe in the name of freedom and honor. The German nation will forever be dishonored if German youth does not rise and speak up—to avenge and expiate, to help in the rebuilding of a new Europe. . . . In the name of German youth we ask Adolf Hitler to give us back our personal freedom, the most precious possession of the German people, which he has taken from us. . . .

After a few moments of tremendous excitement, Hans and Sophie Scholl and their friend, medical student Christopher Probst, were arrested, and the university was closed.

This happened on Thursday. On Monday the quickly summoned People's Court went into session, with the notoriously cruel nazi leader Freisler presiding, and all three students were condemned to be beheaded. “To endanger the National Socialistic way of life,” said Herr Freisler, “is treason.”

After the passing of the sentence, the three prisoners were taken to Stadelheim for execution. Hans and Sophie Scholl were allowed for a few minutes to see their parents and their younger brother, who had just come for a visit from the Russian front. (The younger Scholl then returned to the front, and was later reported missing.) As both Hans and Sophie desired to see a Protestant minister, Lutheran pastor Dr. Alt was permitted to stay with them during the remaining hour before execution. The hour was spent in reading the Psalms, in prayer and meditation. Both Hans and Sophie were calm, almost

cheerful. They felt no bitterness and no hatred. Death to them was only the gate to another life. Dr. Alt counts the time spent with them before their death as the most precious and cherished moments of his life.

Christopher Probst, the other condemned student, asked to be accepted into the Catholic Church before his execution. For quite some time he had been leaning toward conversion, but had always postponed the final decision. Now, one hour before his death, he asked for the Catholic chaplain and was received into the Church. “I did not know it was so easy to die,” he said, after Holy Communion had been given him by way of viaticum. Probst's last thoughts were of his wife and three children (his youngest child had been born a few days before his arrest, and his wife was still in the hospital).

Exactly three hours after the court pronounced its sentence, on February 22, 1943, Hans and Sophie Scholl and Christopher Probst were beheaded in the execution cell of Stadelheim. According to the executioner and an employee of the prison, all three walked calmly to their death, Sophie going first, with a happy, radiant face; her brother and friend following in close succession. “They seemed to be *Begeistert*” (in a state of exaltation), said the executioner. Before he laid his head on the block, Hans cried out in a loud young voice: “*Es lebe die Freiheit*” (Long live freedom!).

A few days after the execution of Hans and Sophie Scholl and Christopher Probst, about a hundred other students of the university were arrested, and three other members of the underground group were condemned to death—Dr. Kurt Huber, professor of philosophy at the University of Munich (born, 1895; executed, July 13, 1943); and two medical students: Alexander Schmorell (born, 1917; executed, July 13, 1943) and Willi Graf (born, 1918; executed, October 12, 1943).

The first three victims—Hans and Sophie Scholl and Christopher Probst—before their death had assumed all guilt and all responsibility for any anti-nazi student opposition, and had died in the hope, later proved vain, that their friends would not be involved and that the whole affair would end with their death. This hope had helped much in achieving their astonishing tranquillity. None of the three had been afraid to die; ever since they had entered the underground they had lived in anticipa-

tion of death. Early in February, Hans Scholl had learned through secret channels that his anti-nazi activity was known to the Gestapo, and that his arrest was inevitable. In agreement with Sophie and Probst, he decided to use the last days of his freedom for an outspoken, public protest against nazism. Through a bold, spectacular act, he hoped to arouse German youth and to manifest to the world that there was a hidden, submerged but still living anti-nazi Germany. The University of Munich, dishonored by the presence of so many nazi professors and students, should now, he decided, hear the voice of the Christian German youth, the youth who had not surrendered. Those anti-nazi leaflets on the stairs of the university were the voice of the small but uncompromising and courageous Munich underground.

This Munich underground of 1943 was still very new, and composed mostly of the very young. It had been started in 1942, when Alexander Schmorell and Hans Scholl decided to mimeograph and distribute anti-nazi pamphlets at the university. The pamphlets, called "*Blätter der weissen Rose*" (Leaflets of the White Rose), soon became popular. In November, 1942, when both Schmorell and Scholl returned from a three-month stay on the Russian front, the underground group was reorganized with the assistance of Dr. Huber and publisher Söhnngen. The leaflets, now called "Pamphlets of the Resistance Movement of Germany" (*Flugblätter der Widerstandsbewegung in Deutschland*), were printed in lots of 20,000, and sent by mail to all parts of Germany. Contact was established with groups at the universities of Stuttgart, Salzburg, Saarbrücken and Vienna. In so far as was possible, the group tried to cooperate with student bodies abroad. Letters were exchanged with the youth of the Italian underground, and in 1943 communications were sent through Switzerland to the youth organizations of Great Britain.

Dr. Kurt Huber, who shared with his young friends a bitter and glorious death, was the beloved teacher and inspiring leader of the movement. A scholar of great erudition, Dr. Huber made a deep impression on his pupils, and his influence was strong at the University of Munich.

In addition to Dr. Huber, among other formative influences in the background of the movement, were two leading Catholic personalities of Munich, Karl Munch, editor of *Hochland*, and Theodor Haecker, writer and philosopher. Hans Scholl met Karl Munch in 1942, and the meeting proved a deciding influence on the course of his life. A deeply religious Protestant, Hans found common ground of thought and feeling with the old Catholic publisher, and was strengthened in his own conviction that nazism was intrinsically wrong. It was in the summer of 1942, when Hans was seeing Karl Munch daily, discussing with him Germany's spiritual problem, that the first publication of the Leaflets of the White Rose occurred. Theodor Haecker, a close and faithful friend of the group, often came to the meetings at Scholl's studio near the Franz Josef Street. Two weeks before Hans' arrest, Haecker was at the studio, reading fragments from his book, *Schöpfer und Schöpfung* (Creator

and Creation) to a little gathering of the young student group.

The names of Dr. Kurt Huber, Karl Munch and Theodor Haecker indicate clearly the ideological background of the group. The student underground of Munich was not a political unit; the young people who so fearlessly opposed their government were revolting against nazi ideology because they were Christians, or felt as Christians. To them, this was a revolt of Western, European and Christian culture against an apostate, barbaric tyranny. The reason for their stand seemed so simple: once the incompatibility between Christianity and nazism was recognized, there was only one thing to do—fight nazism as something diabolically evil and, if necessary, accept death.

The Munich martyrs of 1943 were not fanatics; they had no histrionic craving for dramatic death. The five students who died so calmly were healthy, handsome young people of great intelligence and vitality, who had enjoyed sports, music, books, company. Like all young people, they had looked forward to lives of activity and happiness. But they met the challenge of their times as Christians.

An understanding of the Christian character and the plan of opposition of these young people adds to the tragedy. They did not advocate violence. Passive resistance to the war effort and a refusal to join any nazi agency was their plan. Efforts were concentrated on education of their fellows; through the anti-nazi leaflets they hoped to inspire spiritual resistance. At a time when all opposition to nazism was punished by imprisonment or—eventually—death, Hans and Sophie Scholl and Christopher Probst were helping the Jews and the foreign youth in the slave-labor camps, organizing neighborhood cells to promote criticism of nazism and reveal the crimes of the Gestapo. At night the three went into the streets to paint "Freedom" and "Down with Hitler" on the walls of houses. "Night is the friend of the free,"

Sophie liked to say. On January 12, the official day of mourning for the dead of Stalingrad, the word "Freedom," painted in large white letters, adorned the front walls of the University of Munich, and hardly a door of the houses in the Ludwigstrasse was left without the inscription, "Down with Hitler"—acts of youthful courage which may seem insignificant in terms of practical

value but which were, under the circumstances, all the young conspirators could do.

The defiant students of Munich were only a handful of young people, with no weapons against the iron power of a ruthless military state. They had but one thing to offer for the honor of their country and for the expiation of their nazi government's crimes—their lives. They gave them without hesitation.



Literature & Art

Is all censorship intolerable?

Harold C. Gardiner

Censorship is a hard word, and who can bear it? Nobody, said the American Library Association, gathered in convention at Atlantic City, June 14-16. At least this was the mind of the ALA as reported on consecutive days in the *New York Times* by Mr. Benjamin Fine, and finally summarized in the Sunday, June 20, issue. Mr. Fine claims that at the library convention "censorship of *any kind*, whether by church, government officials or private individuals, was denounced vigorously." Judging from the earlier reports of the convention by Mr. Fine, this conclusion seems much broader than the premises, since in all the actual statements by librarians and guest speakers which Mr. Fine reported there was no such condemnation in absolute terms. The statements of all speakers, referred constantly to "improper," "undue" censorship.

However, though Mr. Fine may have exaggerated the consternation of the librarians, there was consternation. The American Library Association members roused themselves to a proper frenzy during the convention, and departed for their homes determined that they were going to do something to stop the trend toward censorship which they seemed to discern in the current American scene. In the face of the Association's large alarm, and of their very slipshod and even demagogic appeal to "freedom of speech," it seems in place to spend some time reviewing what must be fundamental principles in any consideration of "censorship" and its relation to freedom of speech.

The first principle that must be kept in mind is that freedom of speech is not an absolute freedom. That is to say, it is not a freedom which can ever be totally divorced from or uninfluenced by other factors. In a legal sense, freedom of thought is much wider and much more absolute. Though I am not morally justified in thinking whatsoever I please, under American law I can think whatever I wish. I may *think* that the thing this country needs most is an immediate armed revolution, but at the very moment I try to say this I find myself in conflict with a circumstance that curtails my freedom of speech, namely, the law of the land. Freedom of speech, therefore, in so far as it is a legal right, finds itself subject to the checks and balances of legal duties, and hence is not an absolute right.

The law of the land, then, is one factor that modifies absolute freedom of speech. Are there other circumstances which legitimately modify such freedom?

Yes. There are at least two. The first is what we may call our social environment. People are today much concerned with tolerance between racial groups, with anti-discrimination, with good will and good Americanship. In this situation, though there may be no laws on the statute books to that effect, a man may not, nevertheless, say exactly what he thinks without regard to the social environment. An author may be convinced in his own mind that it is a scientific fact that Negroes are an inferior, degenerate race. Quite aside from the moral evil of such a viewpoint, in some country or other he might be free to say that Negroes are inferior and degenerate. In this country, under present circumstances, he is not free to say it. Or, if we want to be pedantic, he may be free to say it, but those whom he has maligned are likewise free to take steps to correct the saying as far as they can. Since in all likelihood they cannot force the author to write a book proving the contrary thesis, the only means at hand is to do what they can to have his book denied circulation.

If such an action on the part of the defamed group is to be labeled censorship, so be it. Actually, it is not censorship at all. It is a limitation of freedom of speech imposed by social circumstances on an author who has abused that freedom. If we care to go farther and hold that our hypothetical author still has a right to his freedom of speech, then we must likewise hold that the maligned racial segment has a right to defend itself against lies. In the conflict of these two presumed rights, there has to be a settlement for the common good. The peace, harmony and well-being of the country may depend upon such a settlement.

Third, in addition to the law of the land and social environment, there is another factor which conditions freedom of speech, and that is simply the factor of truth. Here again, hewing to our line of legality, there is nothing criminal in a man's teaching in a book that two and two are five, or that George Washington was in the pay of the British King. If he does so teach, however, his freedom of speech is subject to objective criticism, and there is no question of censorship if a book which patently teaches untruth is protested by individuals or groups who know and wish to propagate the truth. We are faced once more with the prime consideration that an individual's right to say what he thinks is always subordinate to the common good. It is much more important that the public read the truth about mathematics or George Washington than that an individual author be free to exercise some hypothetical freedom of speech in their regard.

I imagine that most of the librarians meeting in Atlantic City two weeks ago would very probably agree with these general principles. What exercised them most, it seems to me, was the problem—and it is a problem—

of whose responsibility or right it is to try to apply the general principles above. Perhaps the following paragraphs may clear this up to some extent.

Any group or organization which, under American law, has a legitimate end is also granted by American law the right to employ any legitimate means to attain that end. If such group or organization, then, feels that the attainment of that end has been jeopardized by a book, it has the right to take legal means to have correction made. Much as we detest communism, for example, it is the legal right of the Communist Party (in States where the party is legal) or of the *Daily Worker* to protest a book which sets out to prove, let us say, that it is part of the communist creed that non-communist infants should be roasted and eaten. If such a protest by the Communists succeeded in removing such an untruthful book from library shelves, it would be stupid to let our detestation of Communists stampede us into saying that they were endeavoring to saddle us with censorship.

Under the principle that a recognized body can adopt legitimate means toward achieving a legitimate end, it follows that the Government, for example, may, through some proper arm, such as the F.B.I., protect itself against books whose clear purpose would be to indoctrinate readers concerning the desirability of armed revolt. It is within the competence of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to take legitimate means to have books removed from library shelves which teach objective untruth regarding Negroes or incite to passion and prejudice. It is perfectly legitimate and American for a Catholic diocese to work to the same end regarding books that infringe upon its right to achieve its legitimate ends by legitimate means.

In this connection I should like to quote the statements made in public hearing in Newark, New Jersey, at the time the banning of the *Nation* from Newark public schools was being discussed. In all the furor which was stirred up in the columns of the *Nation* at that time, the *Nation* never once showed a spirit of fair play by actually quoting the grounds on which the Superintendent of Schools in Newark banned the magazine. (As a matter of fact, the magazine was never banned—four issues of it were removed from some students' libraries; it continued to be at the disposal of teachers.) The *Nation's* account of the whole controversy presented it as a religious issue. Here is the real issue:

For the past four years the Newark school system has been devoting its best efforts to the development of a program of Good Will and Understanding in Improved Human Relations, with the unanimous sponsorship of the Board of Education. . . . The Newark schools have given leadership in this field to the State, as recognized by the State Department of Education, Rutgers University and other educational institutions. On June 27, 1947, the Board of Education adopted a resolution formally setting forth the devotion of the school system to the principles of democracy and denouncing all subversive attempts to undermine the democratic way of life.

In line with the foregoing, the following statement is presented to indicate the background for the withdrawal from the students' libraries in four high schools of [the *Nation*].

1. It is the accepted philosophy of American public school education that the teaching of all religions is prohibited by the public school; furthermore, it is a recognized principle that the discussion of the pros and cons of the religious doctrines or dogmas of any sect is taboo within the school. As a corollary, any literature which has for its objective the propagandizing of principles and arguments for or against any religious faith violates the neutral position of the school and, therefore, should not be employed by the school in the training of American youth.

The *Nation* was withdrawn primarily because, in three successive issues, it featured anti-Catholic articles by attacking the doctrines and dogmas of the religion practised by thousands of Newark high school students. These articles, which contained false and derisive statements, were an insult, not only to the Catholic high school students, but to their parents as well.

2. The *Nation* not only features articles by a recognized anti-Catholic writer and lecturer, but this magazine apparently intends to continue its steady attack upon the Catholic doctrine. . . . With all of these there is no quarrel. Any magazine has the full privilege and right to set its own editorial policy. However, publications that are patently anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, anti-Semitic, anti-Negro or anti-American have no place as teaching or reference materials in a public school where adolescents of the community are being educated for social unity and the American way of life.

This, I hold, is entirely American and entirely irrefutable. The Newark Superintendent of Schools, I hold, was doing a service to American thought when he reminded the *Nation* that its "freedom of speech" should have been tempered by the whole American social environment of good will, understanding and cooperation. He was reminding the *Nation* and others that freedom of speech is not an absolute right. Whether or not the Newark decision was the best possible on tactical grounds is another point.

As a matter of fact, the American Library Association convention, despite its perturbation at the specter of growing censorship, by no means even approached a solution of the problem. One section of the "bill of rights" adopted at the convention insisted upon "the responsibility of the American library to provide adequate and accurate information on all sides of current questions." Obviously, then, it is not the responsibility of the American library to provide inadequate and inaccurate information. If one specific group of American citizens can spot a book which deals inaccurately with its aims and purposes, is it not performing a service to American librarians when it endeavors to prevent such distortions from being widespread? Otherwise, how are we going to have what the Library Association itself prescribed—a truly educated American public?

These observations by no means solve the problem of censorship, of restriction of speech in books and its relation to freedom of thought. Together with the American Library Association, I deprecate a great deal of indiscriminate book banning, particularly in individual book stores. I must admit, on moral grounds, that many a book should be withheld from indiscriminate distribution; but the raids on book stores by vice societies and

similar organizations always manage to spread the evil they would curtail. These observations will not be of much assistance to harassed librarians who find themselves assailed by individual irate parents, or groups of them. But it may be that the above observations will serve to produce some fundamental thinking on the rights and wrongs of censorship.

What the Library Association succeeded in proving was merely that librarians at times yield too quickly to protests by various groups; but we cannot, under our American way of life, deny these groups their right to make a protest. If the act of protesting is to be called censorship, it is certainly an extension of the term. Those who do the practical censoring are librarians (or libraries) who remove the books from their shelves, stampeded by the protest.

It strikes me that the Library Association, instead of considering, as it did, the drastic step of blackballing

libraries which yield to censorship, would have done a much more practical and democratic thing, had it set up committees in each State whose function it would be to receive legitimate protests, adjudicate their worth in the light of some of the principles I have mentioned, and then issue a policy statement on individual cases as they arise, for the guidance of all members of the Library Association.

That, I think, would have been a much more fruitful resolution with which to crown the Atlantic City convention than the large, spread-eagle but meaningless statements that censorship is to be deplored. Some censorship—though I prefer some such word as selection or limitation—is implicit in our American Constitution itself. Other censorship is unavoidable, due to social conditions. Still further censorship is implied in the very concept of education, for education is concerned with truth; untruth may not be presented under specious credentials.

Books

"Separation" of Church and State

THE FIRST FREEDOM

By Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. McMullen. 178p. \$2.25.

This volume is a journalist's report on the relation of Church and State in the United States. And this pays the book no mean compliment.

Most current literature on the Church-State question is tediously academic (e.g., Professor Rommen's scholarly but very difficult volume, *The State and Catholic Thought*) or one-sided (certain doctrinaire pamphlets on religious liberty) or incomplete (witness the oft-quoted excerpts from *Catholic Principles of Politics*, by Ryan and Boland) or inconclusive (the pedestrian excursions into the Church-State field by busy pulpit orators and by various contributors to popular magazines).

Of course, these parenthesized references have thrown some light (and plenty of heat) on an admittedly vast and intricate topic, but even *en masse* they do not present the whole story on even one phase of the Church-State question. At best, they have added to the huge accumulation of source materials from which a competent journalist might develop a complete and coherent story on one or more aspects of the problem. In the best journalistic fashion, this story would come to grips

with a single issue, explore its background, draw upon all sources of information to resolve it, develop an "angle" and reach definite conclusions. And this is exactly what Father Parsons has done.

In a brief, readable and informative book, Father Parsons has tackled a single problem—the right relation of Church and State in the United States. He has gone into its historical background with a thoroughness that would do credit to an expert historian; he has drawn upon theology, philosophy, political science, history, jurisprudence and case law (and no small amount of common sense) for data with which to resolve his problem; he has worked out an "angle" (the whole problem should be approached State-wise rather than Church-wise) and he has come to a conclusion, viz., the American way is not "separation or union" of Church and State but "distinction and cooperation" between them.

Not for a single sentence does Father Parsons lose sight of his "angle." "The key to the many misunderstandings" that have confused the Church-State issue is the fallacy "of defining a civil liberty before the State in terms of the nature of the Church, and not . . . of the kind of State we happen to have." Consequently, an American citizen's religious liberty is protected by the First Amendment's prohibition against governmental preferment of one religion over another and against governmental coercion of conscience. Therefore, religious liberty in a civil sense is not derived from a doctrinal principle (of separation of Church and State) which in Protestant terms declares that before God an individual is free to wor-

ship or not to worship and free to select any church of his choice.

It is, Father Parsons notes, "this attempt to read a theological, not a political, meaning" into this Amendment "that has bedeviled the whole question." Those who harp on the idea that "separation of Church and State" and the First Amendment are synonymous are attempting to make the First Amendment "a theological document canonizing Liberal Protestant ecclesiology in an extreme form." And what of those who dissent? They are "anathematized as un-American."

The author's approach raises two questions: what restraints does the First Amendment impose upon government and, second, may Catholics accept the political principle of governmental neutrality towards all religious groups?

For an answer to his first query, Father Parsons drew heavily on the historical arguments developed by the attorneys for the Champaign school board in the McCollum case. These arguments prove beyond doubt that the legislative intent of the First Amendment was simply the prohibition against an official preferment of one church. There is not a shred of historical evidence to prove that the States which ratified the First Amendment intended to forbid the use of public tax funds in aid of all religious groups, if they are used on a non-discriminatory basis.

Father Parsons answers the second question affirmatively. With approval he declares:

... when the United States treats all religions as equal before it, it does not pronounce that all re-

ligions are equally true or equally valid—or equally false, for that matter . . . it treats them equally in the interests of its own peculiar secular end which, as Saint Thomas said, is the *unitas pacis*, the unity of peace, which ultimately is the common temporal good. This it has the duty of securing before all else, as a State.

The author's journalistic instinct (or, as a journalist would say it, his eye for the news) is quite evident in his attention to the public-aid-for-parochial-schools controversy as related to the Church-State question. Rather subtly he says that really there is no relation between the two issues but, so long as so many people think there is, he may as well point out the real reasons why they are voicing objection to aid for parochial schools. Then he drives home his point by citing two statements by prominent Protestants to the effect that the expansion of the parochial-school system would "threaten our democracy by fragmentizing our culture" or "divide the community into sectarian educational systems." Quite obviously, these "reasons" have nothing to do with the First Amendment.

The last chapter presents a succinct analysis of the McCollum released-time, religious-instruction decision. Father Parsons says that in this decision the Court disregarded all historical evidence on the meaning of the First Amendment, with the result that it had to decide the case on the basis of its personal opinions on the right relationship between Church and State. He also mildly reproves the Court for "injecting itself into . . . local arrangements." Perhaps—but let us not forget that in the Oregon decision the Court overruled a popular referendum directing the State to force all children to attend public schools.

This book is as readable as *Time* magazine—except that *Time's* editors probably would have corrected three or four very clumsy sentences. It should be read by every Catholic interested in a comprehensive, clear and convincing report on a controversial issue about which no intelligent person should be uninformed. And non-Catholics, too, will enjoy reading a book that is polite, temperate and unencumbered with ecclesiastical jargon. Respectfully, I recommend that it be studied by the Supreme Court of the United States.

WILLIAM E. McMANUS

(Father William E. McManus is Assistant Director of the Education Department of NCWC.)

Inadequate brilliance

THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

By Harold J. Laski, Viking. 785p. \$6.50.

There used to be a wise convention that the political scientist should leave special pleading to the partisan publicist. Today that convention is increasingly neglected, and a scholar of Professor Harold Laski's stature evidently feels no embarrassment in publishing a

study which combines a profound and encyclopedic investigation of American political and social institutions with his personal animus toward the society he portrays in such a brilliant and vivid fashion.

Unquestionably Professor Laski's book deserves a forward place among the classic surveys of American civilization and the constitutional structure which supports it. It presents a sweeping and indeed panoramic view of every aspect of American life. It peers in-



"The kind of criticism—sober, solicitous, creative—which . . . is the only hope the nation has of escaping the world-wide trend towards statism."

—AMERICA

Alternative to Serfdom

by JOHN MAURICE CLARK

☛ This is the book to which Benjamin L. Masse, *America's* Industrial-Relations Editor, devoted two long articles in *America's* last two issues.

☛ A challenging proposal for the restraint of both big business and big labor, it is, Mr. Masse says: "a welcome and important book, much more significant, for example, than Hayek's *Road to Serfdom*, which became a best-seller several years ago . . . the average businessman, as well as the average farm or labor leader, needs the tough thoughtful fare set out in these pages."

☛ What this book states is simply this: that the price of freedom is its responsible exercise, and the alternative to serfdom a balance between competing groups and institutions, brought to restrain selfish abuses of power by a sense of social responsibility. It should be read by everyone interested in this country's social and economic well-being.

\$3.00 wherever books are sold

Published by ALFRED A. KNOPF, New York 22,
who will send you his fall catalogue on request

quisitively into the structure of our society—into the depths of our literary heritage, into the workings of our government on all levels, into our social and political relationships at home and also abroad. For years to come both scholars and dilettantes will come to this book to learn how our society appeared to an astute foreign observer.

Professor Laski had a double advantage in gathering the facts and impressions which make up the substance of this book. He was able, almost simultaneously, to watch us with the detachment that is the outsider's prerogative and also to enter into our life, in its best academic traditions, as a member of the faculties of two of our greatest universities, and as a friend and associate of some of the foremost Americans of our time, including eminent justices of the Supreme Court such as Holmes, Brandeis and Frankfurter, and even the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Harold Laski's special talents as a political scientist, as an analyst of the records which are the reagents in the scholar's laboratory, and as a creator of a new synthesis from these raw materials, are surpassed by few men living today. It is a pity, then, that Professor Laski has marred the objectivity with which such a study should be written by distorting the incontrovertible facts he presents in such a way as to support his ideological prejudices.

For Laski is a Marxist who believes in the inevitability of revolution. He points to the Russian Revolution of 1917 as an heroic struggle for the lib-

eration of mankind, and he believes that revolution must also come to this country, and indeed to all the rest of the world. But he violates the first principle of the democracy which he claims to advocate by maintaining that the revolution must come by violence if consent is not possible.

Professor Laski visualizes American big business as a villainous institution which since the Civil War has used its corrupting influence shamelessly to exploit first the American people and then other peoples of the world, in a dark conspiracy to advance the special interests of so-called Wall Street finance capitalism. All other American institutions he describes as lesser villains because of their servile subordination to the vested interests.

In his eagerness to win acceptance for this viewpoint, Professor Laski frequently leads his readers on a tortuous trail of bad logic. He generally begins his arguments from the unassailable facts which he has gathered but, before he reaches his conclusion, he goes off the straight path and tangles his arguments, sometimes with *non-sequiturs*, sometimes with contradictions, sometimes with downright silly untruths, and always with a petty bitterness which ill becomes his erudite command of the data.

For example, Laski points out that two of our great American newspapers, the New York *Herald Tribune* and the New York *Times*, present to the public an amazing budget of news which is unmatched by the press of any other country. But he infers that this is done as a sop to the readers, since the main purpose of these newspapers, like all others, is to serve big business interests by twisting public opinion in favor of the capitalist viewpoint and in opposition to trade unionism and the other true interests of the people who have to work.

And so it goes. According to Professor Laski, American culture, the American Government, American churches, the professions, American educational institutions, all trim their sails to the winds which blow from Wall Street.

Thus, the gangsterism, for example, of Al Capone, is but the inevitable outcome, according to Professor Laski, of the use which big business has made of lawlessness and gangsterism to effect its ends. The gangster element soon learns to copy its master's tactics for personal profit.

Of course, Professor Laski comes to the conclusion that our organs of government themselves are weighted in favor of the vested interests. He dismisses our House of Representatives rather contemptuously and, although he expresses a fleeting admiration for the Senate, in his opinion the Supreme Court is an anachronistic device to support the rights of property over the rights of man. Just as most of us feel that the makers of our Constitution were wise to provide for separation of powers and judicial review of legislative enactments, so Professor Laski favors the parliamentary type of democracy which places the principal power in the legislature. But it does not follow that we are wrong and that he is right. Before we adopt his suggestion, for instance, that the Senate be subject to Presidential dissolution in the event of an impasse, we ought to be sure that the parliamentary system is better than ours. Professor Laski believes it is. We have the right to dissent, for it is under our form of government that we have achieved the strength to underwrite the future of Western Europe.

All the while that Professor Laski inspects and condemns each separate facet of American society, he cannot help expressing his admiration for our traditions and even his envy that we alone in this world, as he says, breathe the air of freedom. For he recognizes, even though he tries to overlook the fact, that Americans are free men who are not burdened with the social and class distinctions that exist in Europe and Asia.

It is an exhilarating experience to read this book and to see ourselves as we appear to this learned Englishman who indicates deep sympathy for us as a people but who is so highly critical of our *mores*. The study would be even more useful had there been time for better editing, for as it now stands *The American Democracy* is full of redundancies and repetitions. But this is a fault worth enduring for the sake of the content. Even if it is not possible to agree with Professor Laski's conclusions, the breadth of his monumental scholarship deserves admiration.

LEONARD J. SCHWEITZER

Freedom is for everyone

THE FIRST FREEDOM

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

\$2.25 at your bookstore

THE
DECLAN X. McMULLEN
COMPANY, INC.

23 Beekman St., New York 7, N.Y.



In BROOKLYN it's
Patrick F. Conway, 772 Halsey Street
Handling the complete line of
Berliner & Lanigan, Nevada City, Cal.

BOOKMARKS • VERSE CARDS • BOOK PLATES • GREETING CARDS

The Word

PILLARS OF OUR FAITH

17. *Emmanuel*. Some time ago I chanced upon a very learned book, bristling with theology. It was all about what the author called the big "Christological controversies." Really, it gave me the creeps. Arians, Nestorians, Monophysites, Apollinarians—like vultures, slashing and hacking the lofty mystery of Christ! One Person, two Persons; one nature, two natures! Do you sincerely believe Catholic devotion gained much through the quarrels of all those "divines"? Now that they are gone and dead, I think it would be better to forget all their shibboleths. If Christ has two natures, I am ready to worship Him; if He has only one, I bow my head and bend my knees just the same. And whenever piety is safe, nothing is lost.

I cannot concur with this shabby view of piety.

Why not?

Because our first duty and our foremost difficulty, as Christians, consists in keeping piety and truth together. Pagans can be very pious and, more often than not, they are. Hindus worship everything—a mountain, a river, a statue, a cow—and we call this worship, very rightly, rank heathenism. When you start worshipping, I say that you must know what you worship and why. Otherwise your piety will degenerate into a vapid farce. And don't believe, please, that to insist on linking piety and truth is a light matter. Like many marriages, this union is likely to end more in conflict than as a contract. Piety sometimes may go astray, or be silly. Apollinarius, Bishop of Laodicea, was entirely taken aback when the Council of Constantinople condemned him as a heretic, in 381. "What wrong did I do?" he complained. "I extolled Christ Himself, and Christ alone. I taught that His soul, or at least His mind, was the Holy Spirit. Was that not glorious? An outpouring of piety?" It was, undoubtedly, but at the same time it was heretical.

Yes, I am ready to make a concession. Broadly speaking, piety and truth must go hand in hand. Truth must keep an eye on piety, lest it become erratic or lunatic. But, for God's sake, give her plenty of rope. Don't be exacting. Let her gambol a bit when it does no harm to anybody. In our day, with secularism,

behaviorism, heathenism rampant everywhere, the doctrine of two natures is perhaps a little obsolete, and certainly it won't affect Christian conduct.

Quite the contrary. Do you know what I say when I profess to believe that Christ is one Person in two Natures? Well, I fling in your teeth the explosive truth that *God* was a man like you. A bold statement, certainly, if there is any. All the Christological heresies were desperate attempts to dodge the full impact of this article of faith. Christ, said the Nestorians, was a *man* like you, linked in some special way with God, who is not like you. Nothing very startling about that. The Incarnation was cleverly robbed of every possibility of clashing with our "sensible" views. It was an empty shell. Christ, said the Eutychians, was God, but, properly speaking, He was not a man like you. His human nature was so mixed up with the divine nature that it lost its identity. So Christ was half a God and half a man put together. Not very illuminating after all. Christ, says our modernist, was a man like you, better than you, trying to the best of his abilities to be good and "contact" the divine Father. Not very upsetting, of course. Now comes the voice of the Church, not to uphold shibboleths, not to play with quibbling, but to proclaim in the name of God Himself this bewildering truth that nothing is more congenial to God than man; that our human nature is not to be whittled to fit the Godhead; that in order to be assumed by God in the unity of the same Person, this human nature need not undergo any changes. God took that nature wholesale and *became* man. God knew, through powerful experience, what it meant to be tired, to perspire, to sleep, to be hungry and die. If you think this faith is commonplace, we may as well call thunder a whisper.

PIERRE CHARLES, S.J.

Films

FIGHTING FATHER DUNNE. Forty years ago a zealous St. Louis curate was outraged by the plight of that city's homeless young newsboys. With Pat O'Brien in the title role, here is the story of his struggle to found a home for them and to improve their intolerable working conditions. The picture has more sentiment than depth, and a devious method of soliciting funds—

Schools

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY'S PARKS COLLEGE OF AERONAUTICAL TECHNOLOGY

Founded 1927. Now under direction of Jesuit Fathers. Aeronautical Engineering. Aviation Maintenance Engineering. Aviation Operations.

For viewbook address The Registrar, 748 Columbia Road, East St. Louis, Ill.

IMMACULATA JUNIOR COLLEGE

Washington 16, D. C.
An accredited Catholic Institution for Women. Sisters of Providence of St. Mary-of-the-Woods. Resident and Day Students. Two-year transfer course in Liberal Arts. Terminal courses in Home Crafts, Secretarial Science, General, Fine Arts.
SEMINARY—Four-Year College Preparatory
Dunblane Hall—Grades 1 to 8
Address: The Secretary

GOOD COUNSEL COLLEGE WHITE PLAINS

Westchester County, New York

Conducted by the Sisters of
the Divine Compassion

FULLY ACCREDITED

Standard Courses in Arts and Sciences, pre-medical, journalism, teacher training, secretarial studies, library science, fine arts. Unusually beautiful location. Extensive campus.
FORTY MINUTES FROM NEW YORK

COLLEGE OF SAINT ROSE ALBANY, NEW YORK

Conducted by the Sisters of Saint Joseph

Fully accredited. Bachelor degrees in Arts, Science, and Music, with Science, Commerce, Music or Nursing as a major subject. Teacher Training course offered in all degrees. . . . Many advantages incident to residence in a capital city. Day students and boarders.

For particulars address the Registrar

COLLEGE OF SAINT ELIZABETH

A CATHOLIC COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

On the approved list of the Association of American Universities. Campus of 400 acres. Modern residence halls. Standard courses in arts and sciences. Business administration, home economics, pre-medical, teacher training, music, B.A. and B.S. degrees.
Address Dean, Convent Station, New Jersey

NAZARETH COLLEGE ROCHESTER 10, NEW YORK

conducted by
Sisters of Saint Joseph

B.A. and B.S. degrees

Liberal Arts—Science—Education
Art—Music—Speech and Dramatics
Secretarial Science—Social Service
Nursing—Medical Technology

PUBLIC RELATIONS

DIRECTOR

for diocese or Catholic organization, or editor for Catholic publication. Metropolitan newspaper, national magazine, public relations and business experience. Catholic college graduate. Box H, America Press, 70 East 45th Street, N. Y. C. 17.

Resort Directory

HANCOCK HOTEL ON THE POTOMAC RIVER

48 rooms, all outside. Hot water, showers. Low Rates. On routes 40 and 522, Hancock, Maryland.

THE NEWMAN BOOKSHOP CATHOLIC BOOKSELLERS

Westminster, Md., & 826 Newton St., Brookland, D. C.
Catholic and Secular Books of All Publishers Promptly Supplied. Best Library Discounts to All Catholic Institutions. Monthly catalogue.

Schools

ACADEMY OF SAINT JOSEPH IN-THE-PINES

BRENTWOOD, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.
Boarding and Day School for Girls

School Departments, Elementary and High. Affiliated with the State University. Complete courses in Art, Vocal and Instrumental Music, Commercial Subjects; Extensive Grounds; Athletics; Horseback Riding; Outdoor Skating Rink.

Address: The Directress

SCHOOL OF THE HOLY CHILD

Accredited; College Preparatory and General Course. Art, Music, Dramatics. Outdoor Sports. Resident and Day School. Jr. & Sr. Department. In beautiful Ramapo Valley, 40 minutes from New York City. Catalogue.

Address: The Prefect

SUFFERN,
NEW YORK

NOTICES

12c per word. Payment with order.

SAVE \$2.75. Two dollar gift book *Getting the Most out of Life* plus seven months of *The Reader's Digest*, all for only one dollar. Louis Golubovsky, 364R Rockaway Parkway, Brooklyn 12, N. Y.

MISSIONARY PRIESTS, working in four counties, only 80 Catholics in population of 140,000, need prayers and funds to expand spiritual beachhead. Will you help? Rev. Louis R. Williamson, Hartsville, South Carolina.

JESUIT HOME MISSION—My hope—a school to plant the Catholic tradition. Small contributions are precious and welcome. Rev. John A. Risacher, S.J., Holy Cross Mission, Durham, North Carolina.

IRISH Books, Belleek China, Linens, Celtic Crosses, Rosaries, Cards, etc. Write for Catalogue. Irish Industries Depot, Inc., 876 Lexington Ave., New York 21, N. Y.

which I'm quite sure was the script writer's idea and not Father Dunne's—becomes downright irritating. However, the boys are a natural and sympathy-evoking bunch. Several Irish-American character actors—especially Una O'Connor—do more than their share to lend conviction to the film's humorous sidelights, and its demonstration that faith and constructive effort can do much to alleviate delinquency and social injustice is a timely and wholesome one for the family. (RKO)

LULUBELLE. Dorothy Lamour is the latest purely decorative actress rashly to undertake a *femme fatale* role. The Belasco stage production on which her vehicle is based is reputed to have been something of a shocker in its heyday twenty years ago but, even allowing for considerable toning down in its screen version, it could only have seemed so to an audience that found the mere concept of a ruthlessly self-aggrandizing woman new and horrifying. Today's public, suffering from over-exposure to that particular notion, will find the story of Miss Lamour's rise from a dive in Natchez to Broadway stardom over the ruined lives of George Montgomery, Greg McClure, Albert Dekker and Otto Kruger singularly dull and lacking in conviction. (Columbia)

WESTERNS. The "horse-opera," earliest and most consistently successful type of action picture, has lately fallen into low estate with discriminating audiences. Here are several which make a more or less successful bid for the carriage trade.

Fort Apache (family). John Ford's epic—in the tradition of his earlier *Stagecoach*—has Henry Fonda, John Wayne and as convincing an aggregation of brawny, hard-bitten actors as ever pretended to be cavalymen at a desert outpost in the Apache country. The story concerns a spit-and-polish commandant, who scorns the techniques of Indian fighting in his search for glory and leads his men in an heroic but senseless last stand ending in massacre; and the direction points up in seemingly authentic fashion the gusty humor, the elaborate social protocol and the ever-present sense of danger of the frontier army post. (RKO)

Fury at Furnace Creek (family). The story of two hostile brothers striving to clear their dead father of a court-martial disgrace makes up in good performances (by Victor Mature, Colleen

Gray, Glenn Langan, etc.), superior production and honestly created suspense for what it lacks in originality and historical significance. (20th Century-Fox)

The Dude Goes West (family). Moviegoers who have seen a great many Westerns will probably be most receptive to this broad but generally amusing burlesque, but everyone should enjoy Eddie Albert's ingratiating performance as a mild-mannered, well-read gunsmith from Brooklyn, whose book-learning is an unexpected help in his campaign to clean up the Old West's toughest town. (Allied Artists)

Silver River (adults) cost a lot of money to make and involves even bigger sums on screen, as Errol Flynn is first cashiered from the Union Army for burning a seven-figure payroll and then, in an embittered state, claws his way into possession of the biggest silver fortune in the West. However, neither the large-scale finance nor his David and Bathsheba-like love affair with Ann Sheridan holds much interest by way of return for the spectator's investment. (Warner Bros.)

MOIRA WALSH

Parade

Today's children seem different from the children of yesterday. . . . The activities of modern tots hit the front page more frequently, and cause more raised eyebrows than was the case with the tots some time ago. . . . In line with the modern trend, recent news was filled with the doings of children. . . . In Illinois, a careening taxicab terrorized city motorists. At the wheel was a seven-year-old boy, having fun. . . . In New Jersey, an eight-year-old lad climbed into an empty truck, played with it in urban traffic. . . . In Oklahoma, two fifth-graders jumped into an empty airplane, flew it to Texas. They learned how to fly from comic books. . . . Attracting newspaper attention also was a little girl with big money. . . . She was a Chicago miss, six years old. Finding the family savings, a thousand-dollar banknote, in a vase at home, she went downtown to buy herself a doll. . . . The employment of force as an instrument of policy seemed to be increasing among today's children. . . . Teased by fellow hardware-store workers, a Pittsburgh boy set the

superior
ated sus-
originality
20th Cen-

(family).
a great
be most
generally
ne should
ating per-
ed, well-
n, whose
d help in
the Old
Artists)

a lot of
even big-
Flynn is
on Army
yroll and
claws his
biggest sil-
However,
e nor his
ove affair
h interest
pectator's

WALSH

rent from
. . . The
the front
ause more
case with
line with
news was
dren. . .
ab terror-
eel was a
n. . . In
r-old lad
k, played
In Okla-
ed into an
xas. They
aic books.
attention
ig money.
six years
gs, a thou-
vase at
buy her-
payment of
cy seemed
lay's chil-
hardware
oy set the

place on fire. . . . Flunked in an exam-
ination, an Athens pupil tossed a hand
grenade into the school. . . . In Brook-
lyn, five school boys warned a mathe-
matics teacher she had better pass
everybody in her class or else, then
reinforced their warning by firing a
fusillade of .22-caliber bullets into her
home. . . . With today's children, baby
faces are deceptive. . . . In New York,
a blond, blue-eyed lad of eight, con-
sidered a model boy, committed six-
teen burglaries. . . . Police had diffi-
culty believing they had a sixteen-job
burglar on their hands. . . . Some au-
thorities adopted a benevolent atti-
tude. . . . In England, a sixteen-year-
old lad killed his grandmother with
a brick. . . . The court placed the
lad on probation, but not without a
scolding. "You must learn to control
your temper," the judge told the youth.
. . . Other officials took a more serious
view. . . . A Chicago lad, twelve years
old, beat a seven-year-old playmate to
death. The coroner's jury held the
child on a murder charge for the grand
jury. . . . Today, quarrels among chil-
dren are serious matters. . . . A four-
teen-year-old Illinois boy killed an
eight-year-old girl in a row over comic
books. . . . In Tennessee, a sixteen-
year-old youth shot his thirteen-year-
old sweetheart, then turned the gun on
himself. . . . Among modern tots, sulks
may end in tragedy. . . . In Youngwood,
Pa., a twelve-year-old youngster, griev-
ing because his grandmother failed to
buy him a wallet, held a rifle against
his abdomen, shouted to his nine-year-
old sister: "Pull the trigger or I'll kill
you." His little sister pulled the trig-
ger. . . . Modern fathers are not as
safe with their little sons as fathers
used to be. . . . In Glendale, Calif., a
thirteen-year-old son pumped seven
bullets into his father as the latter
lay on a davenport, then explained
things to his mother: "When we were
at the beach today, daddy was mean
and sarcastic, and I guess I was im-
pudent. I answered him impudently.
On the other hand, mother, I think
daddy went too far. Every time I was
impudent, daddy hit me on the mouth
with the back of his hand. It didn't
hurt, but it was insulting. Now the
thing to do is to call the police. I'll
sit here in the chair and wait for
them." . . . Today's children are dif-
ferent from the children of yesterday.
. . . The tots of yesterday, by and large,
received religious training. . . . Today,
millions of children are being raised
without any religious training whatso-
ever.

JOHN A. TOOMEY

Correspondence

Catholic conscientious objectors

EDITOR: Your editorial, "Conscription and Morality," in the June 5 issue of AMERICA, is apparently a criticism of Father Hugo's article in the April *Catholic Worker*.

The most effective argument against conscription was not given too much prominence in Father Hugo's article, though objection to it from the standpoint of the state's invasion of the person is certainly valid from our point of view. We feel that the very concept of a national state is incompatible with the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man. States, as we have known them, have worked against that ideal, and we should work towards a lessening of state power and towards the eventual withering away of the state. We thus oppose conscription as but another device towards making the state a permanent and all-powerful affair.

Conscription is, however, fundamentally wrong because war itself, all war, is incompatible with the Christian precepts of love—precepts which are integral and necessary conclusions of supernatural ethics. Our Christian precepts of love go beyond natural ethics and the Old Dispensation, and teach, not an eye for an eye, but the obligation of all Christians to oppose violence with non-violence, hate with love. Conscription is, then, a moral issue inasmuch as it becomes a preparation for war; and this, in our belief, is an activity closed to Christians. There has been at all times in the Church a tradition of absolute pacifism. At times (in the early ages) it was the predominant teaching, then it became obscured—it is now high time that we returned to it.

This ideal places no heavier burden on conscience than is placed on it by all the teachings and implications of Christianity. Christians are normally supposed to be at odds with the world—this is just another instance of such opposition.

Jacques Maritain (in the May *Blackfriars*) makes some relevant points:

Decorative Christianity is nowadays not enough. Living Christianity is necessary to the world. Faith must be actual, practical, existential faith. To believe in God must mean to live in such a manner that life

cannot be lived if God does not exist. Gospel justice, gospel attentiveness to everything human must inspire not only the deeds of the saints, but the structures and institutions of common life, must penetrate to the depths of social, terrestrial existence.

We do not believe such a life possible except it be lived in the spirit of Christ. We do not believe that war has any place in such a life or any affinity with that spirit. I'm afraid it is necessary to trouble our consciences with this issue.

ROBERT C. LUDLOW
Associate Editor
The Catholic Worker

New York, N. Y.

Religion and public schools

EDITOR: A few months ago I returned from Switzerland, where I had made a study of religious education in the public schools. I was especially impressed by conditions in the city of Basel, where the law provides for separation of Church and State. But this does not prevent the churches from having religious classes twice a week in the public schools.

It was explained to me that this arrangement did not violate the principle of separation of Church and State because it was not the schools but the churches that were teaching religion, through teachers sent by the churches. In this way very few children in Basel grow up without being taught their duty to God and man, which is probably one of the reasons why this brave little country was able to uphold through the centuries its democratic ideals against dictatorship. The Swiss believe that separation does not mean antagonistic divorce but rather friendly cooperation.

That wise and far-seeing statesman, Cordell Hull, admonished the American people: "As the world faces the supreme crisis of all ages, we have a desperate need for more religion and morality as the background for government. There is no higher civilizing influence than religious and moral concepts. Corruption and tyranny can be driven out of government only when these concepts give men the faculty to recognize such evils and the strength to eliminate them."

HELENE E. FROELICHER
Ridgewood, N. J.



Mama Hanson is the central character of a book, a play, and a recent movie starring Irene Dunne.

The wonderful thing about the Hanson family was the way they faced the future with confidence. That confidence was all due to Mama. "If anything goes wrong," she'd say, "there's always my Bank Account to pull us through."

Things worked out fine for the Hansons. And they never realized that Mama's Bank Account was Mama's own myth.

"**I Remember Mama**" proves something. It proves that, with a reserve fund in the present, you face the future with a confidence and faith that helps you *get results*.

But the average family can't be fooled with a

myth. The average family needs to know that there are *real* savings, *real* security protecting them, good times and bad.

That's why so many families have begun to save the automatic, worryless way—with U. S. Savings Bonds.

Savings Bonds are government-guaranteed to pay back four dollars for every three, and in just ten years. It's an investment that's *safe*—it's an investment that *grows*.

And to make it simpler still, your government offers you two fine plans for their purchase: (1) The Payroll Savings Plan at your firm. (2) For those not on a payroll, the Bond-A-Month Plan at your bank.

AUTOMATIC SAVING IS SURE SAVING - U.S. SAVINGS BONDS



Contributed by this magazine in co-operation with the Magazine Publishers of America as a public service.





at
ng

to
S.

to
st
an

nt
(
or
an

NDS

